

GOLIATH SLAIN,
AND
THE PHILISTINES ROUTED.

BEING

A REPLY

TO

R. CARTER'S SCURRILOUS PAMPHLET,

ADDRESSED

TO THE REV. W. HUNTINGTON, S. S.

By THOMAS PACKER, *K*

**MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST AT PROVIDENCE
CHAPEL.**

How are the mighty fallen! 2 Sam. i. 19.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

Sold by G. TERRY, Paternoster Row; J. ELVEY, No. 93,
Oxford Street; J. S. JORDAN, No. 166, Fleet Street;
R. HUNTLEY, No. 4, Duke Street, Grosvenor Square;
J. MURGATROYD, No. 73, Chiswell Street;
and — COBBIN, Warren Street, Tottenham
Court Road.

1794.

GOLIATH SLAIN,

THE PHILISTINES ROUTED.

A REPLY

TO CARTER'S SCURRILOUS PAMPHLET,

BY THE REV. W. HUNTINGTON, &c.



BY THOMAS CARTER,

MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AT PROVIDENCE,

CHURCH.

How are the mighty fallen!

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

By J. E. Taylor, Publisher, No. 1, King's Cross, London; J. S. Jones, No. 10, Fleet Street; R. B. Johnson, No. 1, D. Street, Grosvenor Square; J. W. Johnson, No. 1, Chancery Lane; J. W. Johnson, No. 1, Chancery Lane; J. W. Johnson, No. 1, Chancery Lane.

Cost 10d.

TO THE READER.

ON my first perusal of the pamphlet, written by Robert Carter, entitled "Remarks on a Letter from the Rev. Mr. Huntington to the Rev. Torial Joss," I could not help thinking it, altogether, so deficient in drift, scope, and argument; so pointless, so weak, and so unmeaning; and yet so full of invective, desperate malignity, and infernal venom, as to be totally unworthy the notice of that honourable servant of God to whom it is addressed. Indeed I have been credibly informed that he served *the trash* as it well deserved, by tearing it in pieces and committing it to the flames. However, such a performance will discover to the church of God the gross ignorance, and base effrontery, of its author: and, I fear, will add such an additional weight in the scale of his iniquity, that some impending judgment will meet his daring presumption; if, peradventure, God should not give him repentance to the acknowledgment of his error *before he goes to the land from whence he shall not return!*

I heard with some surprise, before I sat down to answer this learned performance, that many of our adversaries began to triumph that such an *invincible antagonist* had stepped forth to defy the armies of the living God; and that these Philistines had shouted as though Samson was bound. However, their triumph

is but short; and, to convince them that we are not afraid of such *feeble artillery* as this, I will undertake, by the good hand of God upon me, to refute every argument made use of by this *champion of the devil* by plain *scripture proof*; and will meet this Philistine with only a *sling and a stone* (1 Sam. xvii. 40), for I cannot go forth with the armour of carnal logic, as I have not proved it. 1 Sam. xvii. 39.

There is only one point of divinity in Robert Carter's pamphlet that will furnish any ground for argument, and that is touching the moral law, upon which point he challenges a controversy with Mr. Huntington with the utmost confidence.

However, it is very improbable that Mr. Huntington should enter into a controversy with Robert Carter; his writings on this head are voluminous; and it is not likely, to accommodate such insolent challenges, he should trouble himself to repeat the arguments he has already brought forth on the point. I can assure my Reader that Mr. Huntington is entirely ignorant of my answer to this pamphlet; and, indeed, nothing but that *base scurrility* with which Carter's letter abounds, for *argument* there is none, could ever have induced me to write a reply to it; for it is pregnant with nothing but insolence, lies, and confusion.

Reader, farewell.

THOMAS PACKER.

No. 2, Diana Place, near Fitzroy Square,

July 24th, 1794.

TO

MR. ROBERT CARTER,

NO. 7, MILE-END ROAD.

SIR,

YOU introduce your Epistle to the Rev. Mr. Huntington by quoting a passage, as your motto, from Prov. xviii. 16—"He that is first in his own cause, *seemeth just*; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him." I wish you had first noticed this text, "In righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbour." Lev. xix. 15. But in this judgment you have failed; therefore, "out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant." Luke xix. 22. You did not consider well this passage, "Go not forth hastily, *and* strive, lest thou know not what to do in the end thereof, when thy neighbour hath put thee to shame." Prov. xxv. 8. Thus much for the motto.

You begin your letter by telling us the occasion of your first examination into the letter addressed to the Rev. Mr. Joss; and then inform us that, with many professors, "to be an Antinomian is like what

" is called in Scripture the sin against the Holy Ghost." I cannot tell what kind of professors these are: for it is clear that some or other of God's children have stumbled into every error that the devil ever broached, and yet have been recovered out of these snares, (2 Tim. ii. 26): but I never read of one that ever sinned against the Holy Ghost. So that I think such professors as these must be as ignorant of the word of God as Mr. Robert Carter himself.

You much wished to hear the tenets of an Antinomian fully described, and proposed to yourself much information from such a description; and testify much surprise that, on the perusal of the letter, all expectation of that information vanished. I cannot see upon what ground Mr. Carter could have expected this description from the purport of Mr. Huntington's letter. If I am charged with Antinomianism, it rests with my opponent to describe the error, and prove to me that I hold it: I am by no means compelled to vindicate an error I never embraced. But this is an evasion of Mr. Carter's; it is begging the question: and, as he has professed his ignorance of this error, I will endeavour to describe it to him; though, at the same time, I cannot help expressing my great surprise, that so able a divine, who challenges such a man as Mr. Huntington into the controversy, should be so weak as to *impose* his ignorance on this head.

I think,

I think, then, that an Antinomian, according to the literal meaning of the word, is a man who has, in his own apprehension, got beyond the reach of the law, without ever having been taught by it: or, in other words, has come to Christ (notionally) without having learned of the Father; has come to Zion without being taught at Sinai; and to the mercy of the gospel without the terrors of the law.—Now such a person is a real *Antinomian*, because he sets aside the law in the use for which God has given it, namely, to make the offence abound, and sin to appear exceeding sinful; for the law is a schoolmaster till Christ, and God will teach his elect out of the law; and they that have not been convinced of sin under the law shall never find the Saviour. The law is holy, just, and good; the law is spiritual; the law is a killing commandment, and was added because of transgressions; and is to convince men of the holiness, justice, truth, and immutability of God—and they that know nothing of this, know nothing of the suitability of Christ, the value of mercy, or the worth of the gospel.

A person ignorant of the fall of man, the plague of the human heart, and of what the scriptures say touching human depravity, which things are only learnt under the sharp discipline of the law, will ever be wavering like a billow, tossed about, and at a point in nothing; such are heady, and high minded; lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; floating on

the surface of scripture; living like devils in private; high in gospel notions; strong advocates for liberty, as they call it; living in the spirit of this world; led captive by the devil at his will; callous to the fear of God; the slaves of passion, lust, avarice, and ambition.—Such have their heads stored with doctrine, but in heart they disbelieve it; their head is at Zion, but their heart at Horeb.—And this is a true description of a refined Antinomian; if it is not, let Mr. Carter prove me a liar, and my speech nothing worth.

To charge a man with Antinomianism, for holding that the believer is delivered from the law as a rule of life, is gross ignorance. For the man that is taught by the schoolmaster, and brought to Christ, is no longer under the schoolmaster; for “we are not,” says Paul, “under the law, but under grace.” As to the absurd distinction—of the law being a rule of life and not a covenant of works—it is folly, and evident contradiction. For a man is either under the law or under grace; he cannot be under both at the same time; and, if he is under the law as a rule of life, he is under the covenant of works, and under the curse; for no man can separate the precept of the law from the penalty of it.

You say you are “attached to no party.”—Then I ask, what party is that who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets; and persecute the church of Christ, and please not God, and are contrary to all men? being neither possessors of the

Spirit

Spirit in reality, nor profane in appearance, and yet uncircumcised in heart and ears.

At page 4 you say, "As God has in these last days spoke to us by his son, we are under no obligation *to credit any one*, be their *esteem* among men whatsoever it may." If we are not to credit the ministers that God sends, why is the promise, "that he will send us pastors to feed us with knowledge and understanding"? If we credit not the report (Isa. liii. 1), we can never be profited under their ministry. If God sends a minister, we are commanded to *ESTEEM him highly in love for his work's sake*. 1 Thess. v. 13.

"Free and unbiassed inquiry is the glory of human nature." I read in my Bible *that the world by wisdom knows not God*; and that, with all the *freedom of inquiry* which the natural man may use or claim to himself, he will never be able to, "find out the Almighty" (Job. xi. 7); for "the world by wisdom knew not God." 1 Cor. i. 21. Besides, how can a man be said to be *unbiassed*, when the bias of his mind is only to evil, and that continually; and the devil *leads him captive at his will*. 2 Tim. ii. 26. I read nothing in the scriptures concerning the *glory of human nature*, since the fall of man; if there is any glory *on* human nature, in any sense whatever, it is the glory of God's grace upon the believing soul, as it is written, "On all the glory (or the glorious begun-work of grace
I " on

"on the sinner's heart) there shall be a defence."

Isa. iv. 5.

"Should a man be so *fortunate* as to embrace truth, in him it is no *virtue*." If a man should be so fortunate as to embrace truth, as it is his own act, he is full as likely to let it go again as to hold it. And, if he should hold it in this sense, it would only be holding the truth in unrighteousness. I read of the Spirit of truth guiding men into all truth: but this conviction generally comes attended with such severe and painful sensations, that the sinner would fain run from it if he could; so that, in such a case, he is far enough from aiming at any thing like what you here call *virtue*. This paragraph, respecting fortune and virtue, is so nearly allied to paganism, that I fear Mr. Carter has been studying the *pantheon* instead of the Bible, which holds forth no such expressions in his sense of the words.

If Mr. Huntington "has boasted of his being a minister sent of God," as you affirm, it is more than many, who call themselves gospel ministers, can. I see nothing so culpable in this. The apostle Paul tells us from whence he received both his *mission and commission*. "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Gal. i. 12. A "made minister" is a character of deserved opprobrium;

probrium; and there is no character under heaven so truly awful, and against whom so many woes and curses are levelled, as against those who run unlent of God. Jer. xiv. 14. Read Ezek. chap. xxxiii. As to Mr. Huntington's ordination, it has nothing to do with his commission from heaven to preach the everlasting gospel, neither can such a ceremony be supposed to be a qualification to that work. As to the expression of "leaving the major and taking the minor proposition," I suppose it is used with a design of displaying your *science*, as they are *technical* expressions. But even these are so awkwardly introduced, and have so little point with them, that they are "like a parable in the mouth of a fool." Prov. xxvi. 7.

"*The worst of assassins are those that stab in the dark.*" As the Lord of Hosts liveth, then, Robert Carter is the man. For he never yet possessed one ray of truth, one beam of light, or one grain of spiritual understanding. His attack on the Rev. Mr. Huntington is so scurrilous and abusive; so pregnant with infernal malice; that he has shewn in his pamphlet the very disposition and infernal stratagem of a murderer, who takes the *shades of darkness* to cover the worst of purposes; by slandering, villifying, and defaming, a servant of God. *He that bateth a brother without cause is a murderer.* I see no difference between a murderer and an assassin. *Darkness* is not applicable to the children of God, who are not of the night, but of the day. 1 Thess. v. 5.

"How

“ *How many thousands of your readers and hearers*
 “ *are led away by this artful way of reasoning, and*
 “ *made to believe you are charged with Antinomian-*
 “ *ism for preaching redemption from the law by the*
 “ *body of Christ.*”—The redemption of God’s people
 is rather by the *blood* than the body of Christ, (see
 1 Pet. xix.); “redeemed with the precious blood of
 “ Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without
 “ spot.” And Rev. v. 9. “Thou hast redeemed us to
 “ God by thy blood.”—Although the body and soul
 of Christ was the sacrifice made for sin to divine jus-
 tice, yet I no where read of our redemption by
 the body of Christ. I believe there are few of Mr.
 Huntington’s readers, much less his hearers, who
 are so ignorant as to believe him “charged with Anti-
 “ nomianism” for preaching such a doctrine as this.
 Mr. Carter takes too much upon himself to suppose
 that the many hundreds who have been called under
 Mr. Huntington’s ministry (some of whom have
 known him upwards of 20 years) are not as capable
 of discerning the tenor and spirit of his writing and
 preaching, and also of judging what Antinomianism is,
 as a man whose mind is enveloped in ignorance, and
 fraught with rancour and prejudice.

Your 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th pages, contain many
 very curious remarks upon certain passages of scrip-
 ture, brought forward in Mr. Huntington’s letter
 to prove that the moral law is “done away and abo-
 “ lished,” as it respects the believer in Christ. You
 assert that “the abolition of the law is contrary to,
 “ the

“ the whole tenor of the scriptures, and to reason;
 “ and makes Christ and the apostles liars.”

Now, without following you through the various comments you have given on the several passages in Mr. Huntington's letter, a few words will be sufficient as a *clue* to unravel this mystery.—The scriptures make mention of *two distinct* classes of men, who are to be found ranked under two separate covenants, and are distinguished from each other by various appellations: as, sheep and goats—wheat and tares—servants and children—bond men and free men—elect and reprobate. These distinct characters are ranked under the two different covenants (see Deut. xxvii. 12), and are under two different federal heads, or heads of influence; namely, the old and new Adam. Now the children of the flesh, or the bond children, are under the law, which Paul calls in a figure Hagar, or Mount Sinai, in Arabia, that is in bondage with her children; and these, being under the law, are under the curse; the other are the children of promise, and are under grace, being come to Mount Zion, which is the heavenly Jerusalem, where God commanded the blessing, even life for evermore. So that the believer in Christ, called a son (Gal. iv. 7), free man (John viii. 36), an heir (Rom. viii. 17), a chosen vessel (Acts ix. 15), &c. being under grace, come to Mount Zion, and ranked among the children of promise, can in no sense be under the law and under the curse. Such are said to become dead to the law, delivered from the law,
 divorced

divorced from the law, &c. &c. that being dead under which they were held. Now, if I am not under the law, but under grace, dead to the law that I might be married to Christ, if divorced from the first husband and married to another (that is Christ), in what sense am I under the law? no doubt, to me the law is done away and abolished. Besides, God is called a creditor, and the sinner a debtor; a surety steps forth and pays the debts; the law has no longer any demand upon the prisoner; and is not that law done away and abolished? it cannot apprehend him till he breaks it a second time, which can never be done *if he sin not*. See Song iv. 7. The law is not made for a righteous man; if my obedience is parallel with the law's demands, by Christ's righteousness imputed to me, it has no influence over me; it is transgression alone that gives authority to the law.

I do not say that the believer in Christ has never been under the law before he was called by grace; for he was by nature a child of wrath, even as others. But I do contend that, when the law has cursed him for his sin, and he has been justified by sovereign grace, and removed from under that dispensation, that law is done away and abolished. The third of the 2d Cor. 7th and following verses, is a proof. Mr. Carter's comment on these words is very equivocal and inconclusive. Paul is either talking of the moral or the ceremonial law; if of the ceremonial, I say it was never given to the Corinthians; if
by

by the ministration of death he means the moral law, then he expressly says, in so many words, that "it is done away and abolished."

You seem not aware of the distinction between the free woman and the bond woman. The bond woman in the figure is the children of the flesh under the law. All mankind are by nature under it; the Gentiles, having the transcript of it in their minds, are a law unto themselves, their thoughts and conscience accusing or excusing one the other. Adam was the federal head of all mankind, elect as well as reprobate, when he fell by transgression; but God was the husband of the elect in eternity in the covenant with his dearly beloved son. Jer. iii. 14. When Christ died upon the cross he redeemed the elect from the law—from the curse of the law—being made a curse for them. Moreover, he rose again, and took possession of the mansions above, and received the Holy Spirit *for them*. At the time appointed of God the Holy Ghost takes possession of the heart of every elect soul, convincing of sin, righteousness, and judgment; the sinner becomes dead to the law (that is, dead to all hope in it, and to all expectation of salvation from it); and, when he is divorced from it, he may lawfully be married to another. He is then no longer a child of the bond woman, but of the free. And does the law then condemn, or at all speak to him? No: "Whatsoever things the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law."

But

But Mr. Carter asks an important question (p. 8), "Can a dead law kill?" I answer, there is a manifest difference between a *dead* law, and a sinner *dead* in trespasses and sins *under* that law. The scriptures represent a man in a state of nature as dead in soul, dead in law, and dead towards God. Before a man can feel the spirituality of the law, he must be quickened by the Holy Ghost; and spiritual life, from the "Lord of life," must be communicated to him. When this is the case, he feels the guilt of sin, the breadth of the commandment, the yoke of his own transgressions, and the justice of God. In this state he feels a *living law*, and becomes *dead* to it. Before, like Paul, he was *alive* without the law; but, "when the commandment came, says the apostle, sin *revived*, and I died." Rom. vii. 9.

At page 10 you say thus: "The apostle says, if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves; and, as a remedy against it, he says, if we do sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. If *the law be abolished, his advocateship ceaseth*; if there be no law there needs no intercession. That every man does sin, more or less, is what the scriptures affirm; and it is also true that every *believer* has an advocate with the Father, even Jesus Christ the righteous. But the advocateship of Christ cannot be applied to till justification has taken place in the soul. See 1 John, ii. 12. Thus the sinner *under the law*, and in an unjustified state, cannot be benefited by the advocateship of Christ. As to there
being

being no need of an intercessor where there is no law; a child of God delivered from the law engraven on tables of stone, is not without law to God, and under the law to Christ; but then it is the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which has made him free from the law of sin and death: but *conscience* is a *faithful witness*, and after sin committed, the grace of faith will lead the believer "to the fountain opened *"for the house of David* (not for the bond-children under the law) for sin and uncleanness."

At page 11 you insinuate that Mr. Huntington has "made Paul blow hot and cold at one breath; for "he tells the Corinthians that the law killeth, and "in the same breath, that it is done away." What Paul has asserted is true, whether Mr. Carter understand it or not. The law, under the quickening influences of the spirit, kills the sinner to all hope in it, and expectation of salvation by it: yet when the convinced sinner passes from under the killing sentence of the law, to the life of faith, the law having done its office, is done away and abolished to such a believer in Christ.—The apostle in addressing the Corinthians, is writing to *believers*, as appears from chap. i. 1, where he speaks as follows: "Paul, "an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and "Timothy our brother, unto the *church of God* "which is at Corinth, *with all the saints* which are "in all Achaia." Speaking of the law as the ministration of death, he writes thus:—"But if the ministration of death, written and engraven on stones,

" was glorious, so that the children of Israel could
 " not behold the face of Moses, which glory was to
 " be done away; for if that which is *done away* was
 " glorious, much more that which remaineth is glori-
 " ous: seeing then that we have such hope, we use
 " great plainness of speech; and not as Moses, who
 " put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel
 " could not stedfastly look to the end of that which
 " is *abolished*." Now it is certain here is something
 abolished; and what is it? It is what the children
 of Israel could not look to the end of; but still it
 remains to be asked "What was that?" It was some-
 thing so glorious, that Moses put a veil over his
 face; and this is what Paul says is *abolished*, ver. 13,
 and *done away*, ver. 11. But still the inquiry returns,
 What was it? In verse 7 Paul says it is the minis-
 tration of death written and engraven on stones.
 Then, what is the ministration of death, written and
 engraven? I answer from Deut. iv. 12, 13. "*And*
 "*the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye*
 "*heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude,*
 "*only ye heard a voice; and he declared unto you his*
 "*covenant which he commanded you to perform, even ten*
 "*commandments, and he wrote them upon two tables*
 "*of stone.*"

Therefore the ten commandments, which is the
 moral law and the ministration of death, Paul says,
 speaking to the believers at Corinth, is *done away*
 (ver. 11), *abolished* (ver. 13).

You

You go on page 11. "*From the testimony of Paul the law is permanent.*" I admit there are four several senses in which the law remains unabolished and unrepealed; but neither of which contradicts my assertion, that it is done away, as touching the believer in Christ.

First, It is a schoolmaster to the elect. John vi. 45.

Secondly, The transcript of it is written on the heart of the heathens, who, being without the law written, are a law unto themselves; their thoughts and consciences accusing or excusing one the other. And this law shall be their eternal rule of life and righteousness. Rom. ii. 14.

Thirdly, It is the creditor's hand-writing. Luke vii. 41.

Fourthly, It is the sentence of the Judge of quick and dead. Rom. ii. 12.

In all which four senses the law is *done away* and *abolished*, as it respects the believer in Christ *in this world*.

First, The law is our schoolmaster until Christ; but after faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. Gal. iii. 24, 25.

Secondly, The elect Gentiles, who were without law, being condemned by their own conscience, when enlightened by the Holy Ghost, passed from death unto life by believing, as it is written—"Then hath God also unto the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Acts xi. 18.

Thirdly, As to the creditor's hand-writing, or debt-book, I read, "when the debtor has nothing to pay he is frankly forgiven." Luke vii. 42.

Fourthly, The judgment of the elect passes in this world. "When we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord; that we might not be condemned with the world." 1 Cor. xi. 32.

At page 12 you address Mr. Huntington thus: "You say your testimony for Christ is the same that it was when he (meaning Mr. Joss) so much applauded it. This is what no candid reader will credit." How far *candour* will go in crediting any divine testimony, is hard to tell; but we have generally considered her and *universal charity* of one family, and both of them "Cretians, and liars, evil beasts, and slow bellies." Tit. i. 12. That a chosen vessel, called, justified, and saved, who has received the *testimony* of the Spirit, and an experience that worketh hope, can ever possess a *different testimony* from what God has given him, as an earnest of eternal salvation, is what many a *candid* reader may doubt, but it is what no *child of God* can ever believe. If by the *testimony* is meant, a dispensation of the gospel committed to a man, which is called in scripture, "the testimony of Jesus" (Rev. i. 9), a servant of God can never preach any other testimony than what God did at first commit unto him: for God does not leave his children to the dominion of *free-will*; but saith Paul, "*necessity* is laid upon me; and woe unto me, if I preach not the gospel."

“pel.” 1 Cor. ix. 16.—Besides, the ministers of Christ are all *partakers of the Holy Ghost*, and therefore are called “ministers of the Spirit, and not of the letter;” which same Spirit “shall lead them into *all truth* (John xvi. 13), and abide with them *for ever*.” John xiv. 16. And as God has promised to keep the feet of his saints (1 Sam. ii. 9), and give them a mouth and wisdom (Luke xxi. 15), he will never suffer them to *swerve* from that *testimony*, which is to save their own souls, and the souls of them that hear them. 1 Tim. iv. 16. If Carter’s assertion were true, God’s *purpose*, of saving sinners by the gospel preached, might be defeated—as nothing but *the truth* can make men free—which were blasphemy to suppose. However, I read quite the reverse of all this in the following text: “The path of the just is as the *shining light*, which shines *more and more* to perfect day.” Prov. iv. 18.

“Perhaps you intended this letter for your numerous followers only: it may suit those who have *no eyes* of their own, but *must see* through the eye of their leader; it is sufficient to them you say it, they have little to do with *revelation* or *reason*.”—It is a blessed thing for a man to be convinced of his *native blindness*; for, “God has promised to lead the blind by a way which they know not.” Isa. xlii. 16. I could wish, for Robert Carter’s own sake, he was under this conviction; but I fear, as *he* thinks he *seeth*, “that his sin remaineth.” John ix. 41. “The light of the (mystical) body is the

“eye;” a preacher of the gospel is a light set upon a hill to give light to all that are in the house (Mat. v. 15); so that if Mr. Huntington’s people do see through the eyes of their teacher, it is no more than the word of God says they shall. A preacher should go before his flock both in judgment and experience, else he cannot exhort (Acts ii. 40), warn (Acts xx. 31), instruct (2 Tim. 25), and admonish (Acts xxvi. ix.) I do not know how Mr. Carter sees, whether through the eyes of others or his own; but, sure I am, he is as far remote from God and light of heaven “as from the centre thrice to the utmost pole.” However, he says, “it is sufficient for Mr. Huntington’s hearers to see through the eye of their leader;” and, for my part, I bless my God for ever that I am enabled so to do.—How a man, as you assert, can have *no eyes*, and yet *see*, is a profound mystery.—But God has promised, that his people shall see eye to eye with his watchmen. And as Mr. Carter admits, that Mr. Huntington’s people do *see*, it is a plain proof, that they have *some divine light*, which is sufficient to secure a soul from everlasting damnation; for, *the wicked shall go to the generation of their fathers, and shall never see light* at all. I think Mr. Carter has in this paragraph, not only contradicted himself, but admitted more than he intended. As to our having little to do with *reason*, the less the better, for reason and faith are as far apart as life and death, heaven and hell, salvation and damnation. But as to “revelation,”

"tion," we embrace as much of it as the "spirit of revelation" (Ephes. i. 17) will enable us to comprehend.

At page 14 you proceed thus: "Is the point you meant to dispute, whether *salvation* comes by our obedience to the law, or *by the body of Christ*? this seems to be the point you meant, if there be any meaning in words."—You have given us here your own conjectures, as to what *might* have been the subject of Mr. Huntington's conversation at Bristol: but I think your supposition confers but little honour on him, and adds less credit to yourself. I have before mentioned, that the body, soul, and spirit of our dear Redeemer, was the offering made to divine justice, to procure our redemption from the law's curse. Salvation is no where said to be by the *body of Christ*; for the salvation of a sinner not only embraces the *person* of Christ, but also the *whole of his finished work*; his perfect obedience to the law, his sufferings, death, burial, ascension, intercession, his sitting at the right hand of the Majesty on high, and the descent of the Holy Ghost; together with the whole of his offices, as prophet, priest, and king; his manifold characters, and precious covenant engagements. If salvation were "by the body of Christ," where is the *blood* of Christ that cleanses from all sin? If the *soul* of Christ had not been perfectly holy, and pure from all taint of sin, whence his spotless obedience? If, through the eternal spi-

rit, he had not offered himself to God, how should he ascend to prepare a place for his elect, as the first fruits of them that slept, and send down another comforter? The *body* of Christ's human nature, like ours, was only that vehicle, or tabernacle, that imprisoned his human soul, and could of itself have performed no obedience, made no satisfaction to justice, nor could it have quickened itself to rise again. So that, upon the whole, Mr. Carter has not only exposed his own ignorance here, but has passed a very ill compliment both on Mr. Joss and Mr. Huntington, by supposing that they should enter upon a *topic* which would not have furnished materials for five minutes conversation.

“ This Bristol story quite fails in the end proposed, and turns out to be a mere *gasconade*: for it is well known *you will not face a man of common understanding.*”—I was for some time in doubt, whether I should transcribe this insolent passage or not; because, it is not merely an abominable and infernal falsity, but an affront to the understanding of every man who reads the pamphlet. Mr. Huntington is well known to be a man of great abilities, and has always been far enough from shunning any controversy on this point, and the less so with such a man as Mr. Joss, whom he loves and honours. The account Mr. Huntington has given of his preaching at Bristol, and meeting Mr. Joss afterwards in the vestry, is pertinent to the design for which it is introduced.—On reading this paragraph,
I could

I could not help exclaiming at such unparalleled impudence, "Hear, O ye heavens! and be astonished, "O earth! take up a lamentation, ye mountains! "and let all the inhabitants of the world keep silence!" If Mr. Huntington is so timorous, what must his brethren be? Who will strengthen my arm, and enable me to face this modern Alexander, this invincible Quixote? "He shouteth for the battle; he saith among the trumpets, Ha! ha! "he scorneth the quiver, the glittering spear, and "shield; he smelleth the battle afar off, the thunder of the captains, and the shoutings; he paweth in the valley, and rejoiceth to meet the armed men." I add, "his heart is as firm as a stone, yea, as hard as a piece of the nether millstone; when he raiseth up himself the mighty are afraid!"

At page 14 you go on thus addressing yourself to Mr. Huntington: "You have made a feeble effort "to support the abolition; whether you have succeeded or not must be left to the judgment "of the readers: but to me it appears, you have "taken base means to accomplish your end."—There seems something very contradictory in what you have here asserted; I mean, that "Mr. Huntington "has made a feeble attempt to support the abolition;" and what you afterwards express, when, at page 19, you ask, whether or no that is the point he meant to dispute, and profess your readiness to dispute it with him—and, indeed, all through your letter, you seem

at

at "hide and seek" to discover what Mr. Huntington has meant to support. And this does not arise from his letter not being conclusive and perspicuous, but from your blindness and ignorance. What Mr. Huntington has asserted is true, that the law is abolished as it respects the believer; but he has never insisted, that it is done away, so as to leave the unpardoned sinner without *a rule of life*, and the judge without a sentence; "for the law was not made for
 "a righteous man, but for the ungodly and for sin-
 "ners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fa-
 "thers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for
 "whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with
 "mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured
 "persons, and if there be any thing contrary to sound
 "doctrine." 2 Tim. i. 9.—Take the idea I have thrown out, and you will see an apparent consistency all through his letter. But, if this point "is
 "to be left to the judgment of the readers," and they should be readers as ignorant, prejudiced, and obstinate, as yourself, they will never be able to form a true judgment on the point. And if any
 "base means" are used, by wresting the scriptures to overthrow what they never understood, they may perhaps be under some obligations to Robert Carter for his *valuable hints*.

At page 15 you assert that "the chief design of
 "Mr. Huntington's letter centers in two points:—
 "the first of which," you say, "*is filthy lucre*; the se-
 "cond, to *gratify his railing spirit*."

But

But this first supposition carries its own refutation with it; for, had *gain* been the motive from which Mr. Huntington wrote, it would have been a matter of no difficulty to have enlarged his two-penny pamphlet to at least a six-penny one; the profits of which would most certainly have been more *considerable*.

As to the gratification "of a spirit of raillery," had that been the object, no doubt a better subject might have been easily fixed upon than good Mr. Jos. I can discern nothing like raillery throughout the letter; no discerning Christian can call a zealous contention for the faith once delivered to the saints *raillery*.

Indeed, this is no time to be lukewarm. The disciples of Moses increase fast upon us; and, as in the apostles' days, so also now, "Moses hath in every city them that preach him." Acts xv. 21. But there are few experimental ministers (one among a thousand) to shew unto man the error of his way; and to say to the *self-lost, self-despairing sinner*, "deliver him from going down to the pit, for I have found a ransom." If the Almighty raises up a minister for a *great work*, sets him as an eye in the body mystical, and enriches him with a double portion of the Spirit, and a wonderful penetration into the mysteries of the gospel, he generally equips him with such zeal, and lays the cause so near his heart, that, if a Peter should turn aside and wander into an error through a *false zeal* for the *circumcision*,
 8 such

such an one will openly withstand him to the face;—but this reproof is the effect of holy indignation and pious zeal for the truth, and not of personal dislike and avowed enmity.

For Robert Carter to speak against a *railing spirit*, is the devil transformed into an angel of light, and appearing a *teacher of morality*.

“ Thou that judgest another, dost thou the same things; wherein thou judgest another, condemnest thou not thyself? thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? thou that makest thy *boast* of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God? thou that condemnest a spirit of raillery, dost thou *rail*?—Out of thy own mouth will I condemn thee, thou wicked servant!”

At page 16 you seem much displeased that Mr. Huntington should assert, “ that he possesses a sermon of Mr. Gwynn’s which does not contain a grain of common sense:” “ but,” say you, “ every reader must know that this assertion does not contain one grain of probability of truth.” For my part, I can easily believe it is true enough; for, if a man persist in opposing a servant of God without cause, we often see that the Almighty withdraws the *gift* with which such an one was at first intrusted, and

“ will

“will take that *one talent* away and give it to him “that has *ten*.” When that *superficial light* or *judgment* in the word is confounded, I cannot see how a man should be able to talk common sense, his mind being in perplexity and confusion.

After asserting (page 16) that Mr. Huntington answers the “description of the man of sin,” described in the Thessalonians, you go on thus: “Were “you the servant of Jesus Christ you would have “endeavoured to imitate him, and your greatest “grief would have been, that you were not more “like him. When he was reviled, he reviled not “again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but “prayed to the Father to forgive them, for they “knew not what they did.” Mr. Carter will find it a difficult matter to prove, from the scriptures, the *truth* of this paragraph in the *sense* he expresses it. I do not find that when the Saviour was upon earth, he exercised a spirit of *universal charity*; witness the long catalogue of *woes* denounced against the Scribes, Pharisees, Lawyers, and hypocrites of every description. With respect to mankind in a general sense, the Saviour never prayed for them; as himself says, “I pray not for the world, but for the “men which thou hast given me out of the world.” John xvii. 9. It is true, he did use the words you have quoted, “Father, forgive them, for they know “not what they do:” but it was for some of the elect in particular that he then prayed, who were very busy at his crucifixion; upon whom Peter charged
his

his blood, and who were cut to the heart at the awful appeal, repented and believed, and were added to the church. The spirit which Mr. Carter calls for, is the spirit of *fleshly meekness*; and is as far from the Spirit of Christ, as *light* from *darkness*, *sin* from *holiness*, and *truth* from *error*.

At page 17 you are rather humorous; and in speaking of "the works of the devil, and the faith of the devil," you tell us your reason for believing Mr. Huntington's faith to be "the faith of the devil." Your manner of reasoning is somewhat curious, and deserves notice: first you say that "craft and dissimulation are works of the flesh;" that "the works of the flesh are sensual and devilish;" that "works discover faith;" and that "therefore such a faith must be the faith of the devil." But perhaps Mr. Carter, with all his *rhetoric*, may have mistaken Paul's meaning; for he is only describing the *old* and the *new man*, under the appellations of "flesh" and "spirit," which are both found in a child of God at one and the same time. That every man carries about him a body of sin and death, which will always *be the same*, is clear; because the apostle tells the *Ephesians* to put off the old man with his deeds, and put on the new man, who is "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." If the old man was never *put on*, why the exhortation to *put him off*? Ephes. iv. 22. Col. iii. 9. The *faith* of a child of God, which is a *member* of the *new man* (see Gal. v. 22), is a very different faith from
that

that of devils; for such a genuine faith purges the conscience from sin, justifies a man's person, and brings peace to his heart; which is what the *devils* are, and ever will be, strangers to. But in some respects it should seem that the faith of devils exceeds Mr. Carter's; for we read, that "they believe and tremble." But Mr. Carter "is not afraid of speaking evil of dignities, despising the things which he understands not;" although we read of such that they "are reserved to the blackness of darkness for ever;" that their "judgment of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not." If Mr. Carter had followed his *own directions* he would have *described* the faith of devils, and contrasted it with the faith of Mr. Huntington, and not left us to draw an inference from an argument that has no foundation.

"This spirit unchristians you; it shews you want its greatest ornament, *love*." What is here called a *spirit*, is in the above quotation called the *faith of the devil*; with what propriety must, as Mr. Carter says, be *submitted to the reader*.—The *love* which Mr. Carter here speaks of, and the *spirit of love* (2 Tim. i. 7) are two very different things; the former embraces both devils and reprobates, and exceeds the bowels of the Almighty himself; see Mal. i. 3: the latter will only embrace the *glorious object* from whence it springs, the elect angels, the spirits of just men made perfect in heaven, and the assemblies of Zion below. If Mr. Huntington should
want

want this *great ornament*, it is no discredit to him; for, as a gospel minister, he must shew the difference between the vile and the precious, the wheat and the tares, the sheep and the goats; which he could never do if he did not want this "*greatest ornament of universal charity.*"

"It would be a *disbonour* to human nature, that "your followers should see eye to eye with you in "this, whatever they do in *points of doctrine.*"—If Mr. Huntington's followers see eye to eye with him in other points of doctrine, they certainly will in *this*; for *election* and *reprobation* are doctrines of the Bible, and doctrines that Mr. Huntington preaches. In the beginning of the pamphlet Mr. Carter expressed his thoughts on the *glory of human nature*; and in this paragraph he hints at the *honour* of it—But I think he is mistaken in his conceptions of both. What honour does the word of God put on *human nature* in the following expressions? "We "are all as an unclean thing, and our righteousness "as filthy rags:—from the crown of the head to the "sole of the foot there is no soundness in us, but "wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores; the "whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint— "all flesh has corrupted its way—all flesh is grass; "and the glory of man as the flower of grass: "the grass withereth, and the flower thereof fadeth, " &c. &c." with many other expressions of the like import. If it be objected, that there is honour conferred on human nature where a *human soul* is redeemed;

redeemed; I answer, Paul calls our bodies *vile*, and says, that in death they will be sown in *disbonour* and *corruption*; and, if so, human nature will not be very *honourable* till the resurrection morning, “when this
“corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this
“mortal shall put on immortality.” Besides (generally speaking), *human nature* will not be honourable even then; for some will be cast out as abominable branches; and, as a dream when one awaketh, so will God despise their image. Ps. lxxiii. 20.

Page 18. “Conscience is a *non-entity* of itself. It
“is an act upon a principle.”—If this assertion is true, there is no such thing as *conscience*, for a *non-entity* is that which *never did exist*. But the whole of this quotation is *false*; for the scriptures aver, that the *light of nature*, unaided by revelation, and left to itself, is *conscience*. “For when the Gentiles,
“which have not the law, do by nature the things
“contained in the law, these having not the law
“are a law unto themselves: which shews the work
“of the law written in their hearts; *their conscience*
“also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean
“while accusing or excusing one another.” Rom. ii.
13, 14. If conscience with a heathen is a non-entity, whence come those thoughts that accuse or excuse each other? here must be in this *court of inquiry* some umpire, some judge, some president: the text says it is *conscience*. Now here is no law of ten commandments to *direct* conscience; she acts entirely

free: can conscience then be a non-entity *of itself*?— But it “is an act upon a principle.” Can a non-entity *act*? How has Mr. Carter here contradicted himself! If it is an *act* upon a *principle* it is not a *non-entity*. I admit the *light of nature* is faint, and the light of natural conscience will discover *but little* of the evil of sin. The light of the law is stronger, and legal convictions from a legal conscience are sometimes very deep; witness Cain, Esau, Ahab, and Judas. But spiritual convictions, from a conscience purged from guilt and dead works, are still more keen and distressful—view the effects of it in the repentance of David and Peter.

I would fain discover Mr. Carter’s meaning—He says, “conscience is an *act upon a principle*!” Then what is the principle?—is it natural light? is it the law of God? is it faith? If it is either of these it is not a *non-entity*. Is not an unenlightened conscience what is called *natural reason*? say, then, this is the principle; then the *act* upon the principle is the *judgment* or *decision* of conscience. I cannot help thinking, that when Mr. Carter says, that “conscience is an act upon a principle,” he means, it is a principle *to act upon*. Conscience ought to be the ground upon which the judgment acts, and if there is another *principle* upon conscience, and then *an act* upon that principle, why does Mr. Carter destroy the foundation, and call it a *non-entity*?—I could really wish the judicious reader to consider

two points, respecting this *profound, mysterious, critical, philosophical, metaphysical* extract; and the first is, whether or no this doctrine of the non-entity of conscience is not a principle bordering on Antinomianism, which Mr. Carter in his introduction has told us, that either he or his friends believe "to be like " what is called the sin against the Holy Ghost?" and secondly, whether or no any man, professor or profane, would ever dare to make this assertion, that "conscience is a non-entity of itself," whose *conscience* was not past feeling, seared with a hot iron, and who is given over to "work all uncleanness " with greediness?"——

As to what is further added in the succeeding lines, that "where no principle is, there can be no conscience; that different nations have different principles; that man may be as conscientious in truth " as in error," &c. &c. may be easily answered by my former assertion, that "the *principle* itself is *conscience*;" therefore it may well be considered, that, according to the *light* conscience has received, men may be conscientious in holding truth or error. Your own reference to Paul is a proof: "I verily thought " I ought to do many things contrary to the name of " Jesus;" "but," saith he, "I did it ignorantly." 1 Tim. i. 13.

"Conscience," you say, "is not a criterion to " try truth by." The natural man, whose mind and conscience are both defiled, "cannot try words

“as the mouth tastes his meat;” but the spiritual man judgeth all things; and God has promised “a spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment.” Isaiah xxviii. 6. If Mr. Carter means by this quotation that all *doctrine* is *conjectural*, he has asserted a *damnable falsehood*; for the faith of the operation of the Spirit of God will not receive a doctrinal lie. This faith comes from God, is his gift, and it is called “the faith once *delivered* to “the saints;” Jude v. 3: and as it was *delivered* to the saints, or wrought in their hearts, under the Spirit’s operation, it must be *the truth*; John v. 33: for the spirit leads us into all truth (John xvi. 13.), and testifies of Christ (John xv. 26), who is truth in the abstract (John xiv. 6); and we know that he is true (John v. 20), and that no lie is of the truth (1 John ii. 21). Besides, God gives his people the *spirit of revelation* to unfold the word of truth, and sends his ministers that his elect “may be built up on “their most holy faith;” and, as faith cometh by hearing, and divine instruction is communicated after the glorious testimony is received, sometimes faith, according to the apostle’s words, “groweth exceedingly,” till by and by *divine understanding* will accompany *experience*, and the “believer, having “cleansed his way according to the word,” will say, “I *know* in whom I have *believed*.” 2 Tim. i. 12. Here is faith and knowledge. A tender conscience, armed with the filial fear of God, will dread a doctrinal

trinal lie; hence the prayer, "Search me, O God,
 "and try me, and see if there be any evil way in me,
 "and lead me in the way everlasting!" Ps. cxxxix.
 23; and the apostle's fear and warning (2 Cor.
 xi. 3), "But I fear lest by any means, as "the
 "serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so
 "your minds should be corrupted from the simpli-
 "city that is in Christ; for if he that cometh and
 "preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preach-
 "ed, or if ye receive another spirit, or another gospel,
 "which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear
 "with me; for I suppose I was not a whit behind
 "the very chiefeſt apostles."

There is nothing further in Mr. Carter's pamphlet
 deserving notice, that I can discern, except a little
 postscript which he has added, insinuating "*that, if*
he had sent his letter in manuscript to Mr. Huntington,
it would not have appeared to the public in a fair point of
view." To which I would reply, let the pamphlet have
 appeared in what *shape* it might, it could never have
 appeared, in the eyes of all good men, in a worse
 point of view than that in which the author *himself*
 has sent it out, either with respect to its inconsistency,
 daring presumption, or infernal falsehood!

I would just remark, before I conclude, that it is
 by no means my intention to enter into any farther
 controverſy with Robert Carter: he is a writer truly
 beneath notice as a *religious controversialist*, I have
 already stated in the preface my reasons for answering

his pamphlet. Thousands of squibs, of more consequence than his, have been shot off at Mr. Huntington, by persons whose sole aim has been to obtain the *honourable title* of an *author*, and the *credit* of a *controversy* with so good and so great a man. However, a servant of God has enough to do in the *vineyard* and the *household* without spending his time and labour about that which can never profit, in attempting to *convince* those whom God has declared "shall never understand." Dan. xii. 10. I have studiously avoided the subject, as it respects Mr. Joss and Mr. Huntington, as I would rather be a peace-maker between them, than a *disturber of the brethren*, and a *troubler of Israel*. 1 Chron. ii. 7.

T. P.

POSTSCRIPT.

POSTSCRIPT.

CHRISTIAN READER,

I COULD not rest contented to send this little pamphlet into the world, without addressing a word or two to the *weak in faith*; as, I believe, there are many in the same state in which I not long since was—running from city to city, seeking water and finding none; bound hand and foot in the fetters of legal bondage, and zealously affected, *but not well*, by those leaders, who not only bewitch simple souls (Gal. iii. 1), by beguiling them from the simplicity that is in Christ Jesus, but bring them into chains, darkness, and misery.

There are numbers of preachers and professors, in the present day, who hold forth a doctrine that is partly law and partly gospel, and yet *neither the one nor the other*, but so mingled as to have the *appearance* of both: if such get hold of the weak believer, they are sure, in time, to obscure the work of God upon his heart, and draw him back to Mount Sinai again, under which he continues, working for life,

with the work of God upon his own soul : let him observe whether it leads him to a throne of grace in humble prayer, or whether it sets him to striving in his own strength ; let him observe whether it refreshes his bowels, or contracts his spirit ; whether it communicates *heavenly dew* and holy unction, or narrowness of soul and legal bondage ; whether it enlarges his views, or perplexes his thoughts ; whether it establishes or weakens, comforts or confounds ; whether the Spirit attends it with his own *seal*, or whether it strips him of all divine comfort, and leaves him, like Samson, shorn of his locks. A ministry that does not stir him up, will settle him upon his lees ; if it does not enliven, it will deaden ; if it does not quicken, it will stupify ; if it does not alarm, it will cause the *spirit of slumber*.

A minister, my friends, who is sent of God to preach the everlasting Gospel has always a testimony *within*, which agrees with the written word *without*. If he has been converted to God, he can describe a *work* of grace, and will go before you in experience, and describe more of your feelings than even yourselves can. Watch therefore if the preachers you hear ever hint at *God's dealings with them* ; if they ever describe any inward trouble, and have had any deliverances from it ; if any severe experience, and sweet manifestations ; if any soul-distressing temptations and suitable promises applied — if they have known these things, they cannot help talk-
ing

ing about them; if they did not, "the stones themselves would cry out." The word that comes from the heart will find the heart. If the Holy Spirit is there it will come wet with dew and warm with love, and give a soul-establishing manifestation to your hearts, that it is "the truth as it is in Jesus."

A minister of Christ must sound *two trumpets*, Lev. x. 2.; describe two *covenants*, Gal. iv. 24; and arrange the whole human race under two classes *only*, Zech. iv. 1.—He must preach the law and the curses of it to every hypocrite, bond child, pharisee and legalist; and hold forth the gospel and the blessings of it to every believer; every sensible sinner; every sincere seeker; every broken-hearted soul; every mourner in Zion; every self-lost, self-condemned, self-despairing sinner; who feeling that the law can afford him no help, is desirous of being divorced from Moses, that he might be married to Christ. He must also describe the privileges of Zion's city, and the liberty and safety of the citizens; and also the bondage of Sinai, and the perilous state of those who live and die under that covenant.

Such a minister must also commend himself to every man's conscience as in the sight of God, that he may fulfil the duty of a faithful Watchman, by warning the wicked and establishing the just, shewing himself approved before all, that they might be left without excuse (Ezekiel xxxiii.), and that he might stand clear from the *blood of all men*, Acts xx. 26.

Brethren, I have before observed it is not a time to be lukewarm. Grievous wolves have already crept forth, and more may be expected, for darkness is again covering the earth, and gross darkness the people; the shadows of the evening are stretching out, and the darkest night that ever overshadowed the Christian Church appears to be hastening on.—Oh *watch!* watch and pray; especially be importunate with God to send forth more faithful labourers into his vineyard, and entreat him to make such manifest in your consciences; and be assured of this, that you never shall enjoy *that peace which passeth all understanding*, while in your hearts you nourish a *prejudice* against a servant of Jesus Christ.

There are numbers of *Parkers* and *Rangers* (but not of the King's forest), who are prowling about among the herds, only for the sake of beguiling the simple and destroying their confidence; such as these are zealous enough for the law—and the *despair*, *horror*, and *misery*, depicted in their countenances is a *sure mark* that they are under it as a *rule of life*.—However, if a man has once been admitted into the communion of the saints, and is afterwards discovered to be nothing but a hypocrite, and is cast out from amongst them, he generally cuts the same figure as the man in the wedding-chamber, when these words were addressed to him—"Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having on a wedding garment?" Such may well plead for their *rule of life*, having no
other

other rule than that of the law, which worketh wrath against every child of God who is delivered from that *damning* dispensation. Such as these will ever be the forwardest to support any *hypocrite*, who may undertake to defame a servant of God, by *slandrous* insinuations and *false* invectives, tending to mislead the weak, to bolster up the hypocrite, as well as to help forward their own destruction, if grace prevent not. From all such impostors, deceivers, heretics, children of the flesh, legal workmongers, seducers, slanderers, twice dead and plucked up by the roots, may Heaven deliver us!

T. P.

THE END.



ERRATA.

Page.	Line.	For	read	
6.	21.	For vindicate	read delineate.	
8.	27.	—	whp	— which.
16.	13.	—	living	— killing.
17.	3.	—	and	— but.
22.	2.	—	kill	— candlestick.
31.	1.	—	purges	— purifiers.